

ANTI-INVARIANT RIEMANNIAN SUBMERSIONS FROM KENMOTSU MANIFOLDS ONTO RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

A. BERI, I. KÜPELİ ERKEN, AND C. MURATHAN

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this paper is to study anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds. Several fundamental results in this respect are proved. The integrability of the distributions and the geometry of foliations are investigated. We proved that there do not exist (anti-invariant) Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds such that characteristic vector field ξ is a vertical vector field. We gave a method to get horizontally conformal submersion examples from warped product manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds. Furthermore, we presented an example of anti-invariant Riemannian submersions in the case where the characteristic vector field ξ is a horizontal vector field and an anti-invariant horizontally conformal submersion such that ξ is a vertical vector field.

1. Introduction

Riemannian submersions between Riemannian manifolds were studied by O'Neill [16] and Gray [9]. Riemannian submersions have several applications in mathematical physics. Indeed, Riemannian submersions have their applications in the Yang-Mills theory ([4], [27]), Kaluza-Klein theory ([5], [10]), supergravity and superstring theories ([11], [28]), etc. Later such submersions were considered between manifolds with differentiable structures, see [8]. Furthermore, we have the following submersions: semi-Riemannian submersion and Lorentzian submersion [8], Riemannian submersion [9], slant submersion ([7], [23]), almost Hermitian submersion [26], contact-complex submersion [13], quaternionic submersion [12], almost h -slant submersion and h -slant submersion [19], semi-invariant submersion [25], h -semi-invariant submersion [20], etc.

Comparing with the huge literature in Riemannian submersions, it seems that there are necessary new studies in anti-invariant Riemannian submersions; an interesting paper connecting these fields is [22]. Şahin [22] introduced anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds. Later, he suggested to investigate anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from almost contact metric manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds [24]. The present work is another step in this direction, more precisely from the point of view of anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds. Our work is structured as follows: Section 2 is focused on basic facts for Riemannian submersions and Kenmotsu manifolds. The third section is concerned with definition of anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds. We investigate the integrability of the distributions

Date: 26.08.2015.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 53C25, 53C43, 53C55; Secondary 53D15.

Key words and phrases. Riemannian submersion, conformal submersion, Warped product, Kenmotsu manifold, Anti-invariant Riemannian submersion.

and the geometry of foliations. We proved that there do not exist (anti-invariant) Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds such that characteristic vector field ξ is vertical vector field. The last section is devoted to an example of anti-invariant Riemannian submersions in the case where the characteristic vector field ξ is a horizontal vector field and an anti-invariant horizontally conformal submersion such that ξ is a vertical vector field.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we recall several notions and results which will be needed throughout the paper.

Let M be an $(2m+1)$ -dimensional connected differentiable manifold [3] endowed with an almost contact metric structure (ϕ, ξ, η, g) consisting of a $(1, 1)$ -tensor field ϕ , a vector field ξ , a 1-form η and a compatible Riemannian metric g satisfying

$$(2.1) \quad \phi^2 = -I + \eta \otimes \xi, \quad \phi\xi = 0, \quad \eta \circ \phi = 0, \quad \eta(\xi) = 1,$$

$$(2.2) \quad g(\phi X, \phi Y) = g(X, Y) - \eta(X)\eta(Y),$$

$$(2.3) \quad g(\phi X, Y) + g(X, \phi Y) = 0, \quad \eta(X) = g(X, \xi),$$

for all vector fields $X, Y \in \chi(M)$.

An almost contact metric manifold M is said to be a Kenmotsu manifold [14] if it satisfies

$$(2.4) \quad (\nabla_X \phi)Y = g(\phi X, Y)\xi - \eta(Y)\phi X,$$

where ∇ is Levi-Civita connection of the Riemannian metric g . From the above equation it follows that

$$(2.5) \quad \nabla_X \xi = X - \eta(X)\xi,$$

$$(2.6) \quad (\nabla_X \eta)Y = g(X, Y) - \eta(X)\eta(Y).$$

A Kenmotsu manifold is normal (that is, the Nijenhuis tensor of ϕ equals $-2d\eta \otimes \xi$) but not Sasakian. Moreover, it is also not compact since from equation (2.5) we get $\text{div} \xi = 2m$. Finally, the fundamental 2-form Φ is defined by $\Phi(X, Y) = g(X, \phi Y)$. In [14], Kenmotsu showed:

(a) that locally a Kenmotsu manifold is a warped product $I \times_f N$ of an interval I and a Kaehler manifold N with warping function $f(t) = se^t$, where s is a nonzero constant.

(b) that a Kenmotsu manifold of constant ϕ -sectional curvature is a space of constant curvature -1 and so it is locally hyperbolic space.

Now we will give a well known example which is Kenmotsu manifold on \mathbb{R}^5 by using (a).

Example 1. We consider $M = \{(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z) \in \mathbb{R}^5 : z \neq 0\}$. Let η be a 1-form defined by

$$\eta = dz.$$

The characteristic vector field ξ is given by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and its Riemannian metric g in and tensor field ϕ are given by

$$g = e^{2z} \sum_{i=1}^2 ((dx_i)^2 + (dy_i)^2) + (dz)^2, \quad \phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

This gives a Kenmotsu structure on M . The vector fields $E_1 = e^{-z} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}$, $E_2 = e^{-z} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_2}$, $E_3 = e^{-z} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$, $E_4 = e^{-z} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}$ and $E_5 = \xi$ form a ϕ -basis for the Kenmotsu structure. On the other hand, it can be shown that $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g)$ is a Kenmotsu manifold.

Let (M, g_M) be an m -dimensional Riemannian manifold and let (N, g_N) be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. A Riemannian submersion is a smooth map $F : M \rightarrow N$ which is onto and satisfying the following axioms:

S1. F has maximal rank.

S2. The differential F_* preserves the lengths of horizontal vectors.

The fundamental tensors of a submersion were defined by O'Neill ([16],[17]). They are $(1, 2)$ -tensors on M , given by the following formulas:

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{T}(E, F) = \mathcal{T}_E F = \mathcal{H}\nabla_{\mathcal{V}E} \mathcal{V}F + \mathcal{V}\nabla_{\mathcal{V}E} \mathcal{H}F,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{A}(E, F) = \mathcal{A}_E F = \mathcal{V}\nabla_{\mathcal{H}E} \mathcal{H}F + \mathcal{H}\nabla_{\mathcal{H}E} \mathcal{V}F,$$

for any vector fields E and F on M . Here ∇ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of g_M . These tensors are called integrability tensors for the Riemannian submersions. Note that we denote the projection morphism on the distributions $\ker F_*$ and $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ by \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{H} , respectively.

If the second condition S2. can be changed as F_* restricted to horizontal distribution of F is a conformal mapping, we get *horizontally conformal submersion* definition [18]. In this case the second condition can be written in a following way:

$$(2.9) \quad g_M(X, Y) = e^{2\lambda(p)} g_N(F_* X, F_* Y), \forall p \in M, \forall X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp), \exists \lambda \in C^\infty(M).$$

The warped product $M = M_1 \times_f M_2$ of two Riemannian manifolds (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) , is the Cartesian product manifold $M_1 \times M_2$, endowed with the warped product metric $g = g_1 + f g_2$, where f is a positive function on M_1 . More precisely, the Riemannian metric g on $M_1 \times_f M_2$ is defined for pairs of vector fields X, Y on $M_1 \times M_2$ by

$$g(X, Y) = g_1(\pi_{1*}(X), \pi_{1*}(Y)) + f^2(\pi_1(\cdot)) g_2(\pi_{2*}(X), \pi_{2*}(Y)),$$

where $\pi_1 : M_1 \times M_2 \rightarrow M_1; (p, q) \rightarrow p$ and $\pi_2 : M_1 \times M_2 \rightarrow M_2; (p, q) \rightarrow q$ are the canonical projections. We recall that this projections are submersions. If f is not a constant function of value 1, one can prove that second projection is a conformal submersion whose vertical and horizontal spaces at any point (p, q) are respectively identified with $T_p M_1, T_q M_2$.

Let $\mathcal{L}(M_1)$ and $\mathcal{L}(M_2)$ be the set of lifts of vector fields on M_1 and M_2 to $M_1 \times_f M_2$ respectively. We use the same notation for a vector field and for its lift. We denote the Levi-Civita connection of the warped product metric tensor of g by ∇ .

Proposition 1. [17] $M = M_1 \times_f M_2$ be a warped Riemannian product manifold with the warping function f on M_1 . If $X_1, Y_1 \in \mathcal{L}(M_1)$ and $X_2, Y_2 \in \mathcal{L}(M_2)$, then

(i) $\nabla_{X_1} Y_1$ is the lift of $\nabla_{X_1}^1 Y_1$,

(ii) $\nabla_{X_1} X_2 = \nabla_{X_2} X_1 = (X_1 f / f) X_2$,

(iii) $\nabla_{X_2} Y_2 = -(g(X_2, Y_2) / f) \text{grad} f$,

(iv) $\text{tan } \nabla_{X_2} Y_2 \in \mathcal{L}(M_2)$ is the lift of $\nabla_{X_2}^2 Y_2$,

where ∇^1 and ∇^2 are Riemannian connections on M_1 and M_2 , respectively.

Now we will introduce the following proposition ([6], pp.86) for the Subsection 3.2.

Proposition 2. If ϕ is a submersion of N onto N_1 and if $\psi : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ is a differentiable function, then the rank of $\psi \circ \phi$ at p is equal to the rank of ψ at $\phi(p)$.

The following lemmas are well known from ([16],[17]):

Lemma 1. *For any U, W vertical and X, Y horizontal vector fields, the tensor fields \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{A} satisfy*

$$(2.10) \quad i)\mathcal{T}_U W = \mathcal{T}_W U,$$

$$(2.11) \quad ii)\mathcal{A}_X Y = -\mathcal{A}_Y X = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}[X, Y].$$

It is easy to see that \mathcal{T} is vertical, $\mathcal{T}_E = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{V}E}$, and \mathcal{A} is horizontal, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}E}$.

For each $q \in N$, $F^{-1}(q)$ is an $(m-n)$ -dimensional submanifold of M . The submanifolds $F^{-1}(q)$ are called fibers. A vector field on M is called vertical if it is always tangent to fibers. A vector field on M is called horizontal if it is always orthogonal to fibers. A vector field X on M is called basic if X is horizontal and F -related to a vector field X_* on N , i. e., $F_*X_p = X_{*F(p)}$ for all $p \in M$.

Lemma 2. *Let $F : (M, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be a Riemannian submersion. If X, Y are basic vector fields on M , then*

$$i) \ g_M(X, Y) = g_N(X_*, Y_*) \circ F,$$

$$ii) \ \mathcal{H}[X, Y] \text{ is basic and } F\text{-related to } [X_*, Y_*],$$

iii) $\mathcal{H}(\nabla_X Y)$ is a basic vector field corresponding to $\nabla_{X_*}^* Y_*$ where ∇^* is the connection on N .

$$iv) \text{ for any vertical vector field } V, [X, V] \text{ is vertical.}$$

Moreover, if X is basic and U is vertical, then $\mathcal{H}(\nabla_U X) = \mathcal{H}(\nabla_X U) = \mathcal{A}_X U$. On the other hand, from (2.7) and (2.8) we have

$$(2.12) \quad \nabla_V W = \mathcal{T}_V W + \hat{\nabla}_V W,$$

$$(2.13) \quad \nabla_V X = \mathcal{H}\nabla_V X + \mathcal{T}_V X,$$

$$(2.14) \quad \nabla_X V = \mathcal{A}_X V + \mathcal{V}\nabla_X V,$$

$$(2.15) \quad \nabla_X Y = \mathcal{H}\nabla_X Y + \mathcal{A}_X Y,$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V, W \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$, where $\hat{\nabla}_V W = \mathcal{V}\nabla_V W$.

Notice that \mathcal{T} acts on the fibres as the second fundamental form of the submersion and restricted to vertical vector fields and it can be easily seen that $\mathcal{T} = 0$ is equivalent to the condition that the fibres are totally geodesic. A Riemannian submersion is called a Riemannian submersion with totally geodesic fibers if \mathcal{T} vanishes identically. Let U_1, \dots, U_{m-n} be an orthonormal frame of $\Gamma(\ker F_*)$. Then the horizontal vector field $H = \frac{1}{m-n} \sum_{j=1}^{m-n} \mathcal{T}_{U_j} U_j$ is called the mean curvature vector field of the fiber. If $H = 0$, then the Riemannian submersion is said to be minimal. A Riemannian submersion is called a Riemannian submersion with totally umbilical fibers if

$$(2.16) \quad \mathcal{T}_U W = g_M(U, W)H,$$

for $U, W \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$. For any $E \in \Gamma(TM)$, \mathcal{T}_E and \mathcal{A}_E are skew-symmetric operators on $(\Gamma(TM), g_M)$ reversing the horizontal and the vertical distributions. By Lemma 1, horizontal distribution \mathcal{H} is integrable if and only if $\mathcal{A} = 0$. For any $D, E, G \in \Gamma(TM)$, one has

$$(2.17) \quad g(\mathcal{T}_D E, G) + g(\mathcal{T}_D G, E) = 0$$

and

$$(2.18) \quad g(\mathcal{A}_D E, G) + g(\mathcal{A}_D G, E) = 0.$$

Finally, we recall the notion of harmonic maps between Riemannian manifolds. Let (M, g_M) and (N, g_N) be Riemannian manifolds and supposed that $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ is a smooth map between them. Then the differential φ_* of φ can be viewed as a section of the bundle $Hom(TM, \varphi^{-1}TN) \rightarrow M$, where $\varphi^{-1}TN$ is the pullback bundle which has fibres $(\varphi^{-1}TN)_p = T_{\varphi(p)}N$, $p \in M$. $Hom(TM, \varphi^{-1}TN)$ has a connection ∇ induced from the Levi-Civita connection ∇^M and the pullback connection. Then the second fundamental form of φ is given by

$$(2.19) \quad (\nabla\varphi_*)(X, Y) = \nabla_X^\varphi \varphi_*(Y) - \varphi_*(\nabla_X^M Y),$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma(TM)$, where ∇^φ is the pullback connection. It is known that the second fundamental form is symmetric. If φ is a Riemannian submersion, it can be easily proved that

$$(2.20) \quad (\nabla\varphi_*)(X, Y) = 0,$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$. A smooth map $\varphi : (M, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ is said to be harmonic if $trace(\nabla\varphi_*) = 0$. On the other hand, the tension field of φ is the section $\tau(\varphi)$ of $\Gamma(\varphi^{-1}TN)$ defined by

$$(2.21) \quad \tau(\varphi) = div\varphi_* = \sum_{i=1}^m (\nabla\varphi_*)(e_i, e_i),$$

where $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ is the orthonormal frame on M . Then it follows that φ is harmonic if and only if $\tau(\varphi) = 0$, (for details, see [2]).

Let g be a Riemannian metric tensor on the manifold $M = M_1 \times M_2$ and assume that the canonical foliations D_{M_1} and D_{M_2} intersect perpendicularly everywhere. Then g is the metric tensor of a usual product of Riemannian manifolds if and only if D_{M_1} and D_{M_2} are totally geodesic foliations [21].

3. Anti-invariant Riemannian submersions

In this section, we are going to define anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds and investigate the geometry of such submersions.

Definition 1. Let $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ be a Kenmotsu manifold and (N, g_N) a Riemannian manifold. A Riemannian submersion $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ is called an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion if $\ker F_*$ is anti-invariant with respect to ϕ , i.e. $\phi(\ker F_*) \subseteq (\ker F_*)^\perp$.

Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion from a Kenmotsu manifold $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ to a Riemannian manifold (N, g_N) . First of all, from Definition 1, we have $\phi(\ker F_*)^\perp \cap (\ker F_*) \neq \{0\}$. We denote the complementary orthogonal distribution to $\phi(\ker F_*)$ in $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ by μ . Then we have

$$(3.1) \quad (\ker F_*)^\perp = \phi \ker F_* \oplus \mu.$$

3.1. Anti-invariant Riemannian submersions admitting horizontal structure vector field. In this subsection, we will study anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from a Kenmotsu manifold onto a Riemannian manifold such that the characteristic vector field ξ is a horizontal vector field. Using (3.1), we have $\mu = \phi\mu \oplus \{\xi\}$. For any horizontal vector field X we put

$$(3.2) \quad \phi X = BX + CX,$$

where $BX \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$ and $CX \in \Gamma(\mu)$.

Now we suppose that V is vertical and X is horizontal vector field. Using above relation and (2.2), we obtain

$$(3.3) \quad g_M(CX, \phi V) = 0.$$

By virtue of (2.2) and (3.2), we get

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} g_M(CX, \phi U) &= g_M(\phi X - BX, \phi U) \\ &= g_M(X, U) - \eta(X)\eta(U) - g_M(BX, \phi U). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi U \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $\xi \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)^\perp$, (3.4) implies (3.3). From this last relation we have $g_N(F_*\phi V, F_*CX) = 0$ which implies that

$$(3.5) \quad TN = F_*(\phi(\ker F_*)) \oplus F_*(\mu).$$

The proof of the following result is the same as Theorem 10 of [15], therefore we omit its proof.

Theorem 1. *Let $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ be a Kenmotsu manifold of dimension $2m + 1$ and (N, g_N) a Riemannian manifold of dimension n . Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion such that $(\ker F_*)^\perp = \phi \ker F_* \oplus \{\xi\}$. Then $m + 1 = n$.*

Remark 1. *We note that Example 2 satisfies Theorem 1.*

Lemma 3. *Let F be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion from a Kenmotsu manifold $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ to a Riemannian manifold (N, g_N) . Then we have*

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{A}_X \xi = 0,$$

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{T}_U \xi = U,$$

$$(3.8) \quad g_M(\nabla_Y CX, \phi U) = -g_M(CX, \phi \mathcal{A}_Y U),$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $U \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$.

Proof. Using (2.15) and (2.5), we have (3.6). Using (2.13) and (2.5), we obtain (3.7). Now using (3.3), we get

$$g_M(\nabla_Y CX, \phi U) = -g_M(CX, \nabla_Y \phi U),$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $U \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$. Then (2.14) and (2.4) imply that

$$g_M(\nabla_Y CX, \phi U) = -g_M(CX, \phi \mathcal{A}_Y U) - g_M(CX, \phi(\mathcal{V}\nabla_Y U)).$$

Since $\phi(\mathcal{V}\nabla_Y U) \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$, we obtain (3.8). \square

We now study the integrability of the distribution $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ and then we investigate the geometry of leaves of $\ker F_*$ and $(\ker F_*)^\perp$.

Theorem 2. *Let F be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion from a Kenmotsu manifold $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ to a Riemannian manifold (N, g_N) . Then the following assertions are equivalent to each other:*

- i) $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ is integrable,
 - ii) $g_N((\nabla F_*)(Y, BX), F_*\phi V) = g_N((\nabla F_*)(X, BX), F_*\phi V) + g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V) - g_M(CX, \phi \mathcal{A}_Y V),$
 - iii) $g_M(\mathcal{A}_X BY - \mathcal{A}_Y BX, \phi V) = g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V) - g_M(CX, \phi \mathcal{A}_Y V)$
- for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$.

Proof. From (2.2) and (2.4), one easily obtains

$$\begin{aligned} g_M([X, Y], V) &= g_M(\nabla_X Y, V) - g_M(\nabla_Y X, V) \\ &= g_M(\nabla_X \phi Y, \phi V) - g_M(\nabla_Y \phi X, \phi V). \end{aligned}$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$. Then from (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_M([X, Y], V) &= g_M(\nabla_X BY, \phi V) + g_M(\nabla_X CY, \phi V) - g_M(\nabla_Y BX, \phi V) \\ &\quad - g_M(\nabla_Y CX, \phi V). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account that F is a Riemannian submersion and using (2.8), (2.14) and (3.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_M([X, Y], V) &= g_N(F_* \nabla_X BY, F_* \phi V) - g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V) \\ &\quad - g_N(F_* \nabla_Y BX, F_* \phi V) + g_M(CX, \phi \mathcal{A}_Y V). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (2.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_M([X, Y], V) &= g_N(-(\nabla F_*)(X, BY) + (\nabla F_*)(Y, BX), F_* \phi V) \\ &\quad + g_M(CX, \phi \mathcal{A}_Y V) - g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V) \end{aligned}$$

which proves (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii). On the other hand using (2.19), we get

$$(\nabla F_*)(Y, BX) - (\nabla F_*)(X, BY) = -F_*(\nabla_Y BX - \nabla_X BY).$$

Then (2.14) implies that

$$(\nabla F_*)(Y, BX) - (\nabla F_*)(X, BY) = -F_*(\mathcal{A}_Y BX - \mathcal{A}_X BY).$$

From (2.8) it follows that $\mathcal{A}_Y BX - \mathcal{A}_X BY \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$, this shows that (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii). \square

Remark 2. We assume that $(\ker F_*)^\perp = \phi \ker F_* \oplus \{\xi\}$. Using (3.2) one can prove that $CX = 0$ for $X \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$.

Hence we can give the following corollary.

Corollary 1. Let $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ be a Kenmotsu manifold of dimension $2m + 1$ and (N, g_N) a Riemannian manifold of dimension n . Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion such that $(\ker F_*)^\perp = \phi \ker F_* \oplus \{\xi\}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent to each other:

- i) $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ is integrable,
- ii) $(\nabla F_*)(X, \phi Y) = (\nabla F_*)(\phi X, Y)$, for $X \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$,
- iii) $\mathcal{A}_X \phi Y = \mathcal{A}_Y \phi X$.

Theorem 3. Let $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ be a Kenmotsu manifold of dimension $2m + 1$ and (N, g_N) a Riemannian manifold of dimension n . Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion. Then the following assertions are equivalent to each other:

- i) $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ defines a totally geodesic foliation on M ,
- ii) $g_M(\mathcal{A}_X BY, \phi V) = g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V)$,
- iii) $g_N((\nabla F_*)(X, \phi Y), F_* \phi V) = -g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V)$,
for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$.

Proof. From (2.2) and (2.4), we obtain

$$g_M(\nabla_X Y, V) = g_M(\nabla_X \phi Y, \phi V),$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$. By virtue of (3.2), we get

$$g_M(\nabla_X Y, V) = g_M(\nabla_X BY + \nabla_X CY, \phi V).$$

Using (2.14) and (3.8), we have

$$g_M(\nabla_X Y, V) = g_M(\mathcal{A}_X BY + \mathcal{V} \nabla_X BY, \phi V) - g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V).$$

The last equation shows (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii).

For $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$,

$$(3.9) \quad g_M(\mathcal{A}_X BY, \phi V) = g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V)$$

Since differential F_* preserves the lengths of horizontal vectors the relation (3.9) forms

$$(3.10) \quad g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V) = g_N(F_* \mathcal{A}_X BY, F_* \phi V)$$

By using (2.14) and (2.19) in (3.10), we obtain

$$g_M(CY, \phi \mathcal{A}_X V) = g_N(-(\nabla F_*)(X, \phi Y), F_* \phi V)$$

which tells that (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii). \square

Corollary 2. *Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion such that $(\ker F_*)^\perp = \phi \ker F_* \oplus \{\xi\}$, where $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ is a Kenmotsu manifold and (N, g_N) is a Riemannian manifold. Then the following assertions are equivalent to each other:*

- i) $(\ker F_*)^\perp$ defines a totally geodesic foliation on M ,
- ii) $\mathcal{A}_X \phi Y = 0$,
- iii) $(\nabla F_*)(X, \phi Y) = 0$ for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$.

The following result is a consequence from (2.12) and (3.7).

Theorem 4. *Let F be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion from a Kenmotsu manifold $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ to a Riemannian manifold (N, g_N) . Then $(\ker F_*)$ does not define a totally geodesic foliation on M .*

Using Theorem 4, one can give the following result.

Theorem 5. *Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion where $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ is a Kenmotsu manifold and (N, g_N) is a Riemannian manifold. Then F is not a totally geodesic map.*

Remark 3. *Now we suppose that $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ is a local orthonormal frame of $\Gamma(\ker F_*)$.*

From the well known equation $H = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{T}_{e_i} e_i$, (2.12) and (2.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned} mg(H, \xi) &= g(T_{e_1} e_1, \xi) + g(T_{e_2} e_2, \xi) + \dots + g(T_{e_m} e_m, \xi) \\ &= -g(T_{e_1} \xi, e_1) - g(T_{e_2} \xi, e_2) - \dots - g(T_{e_m} \xi, e_m) \\ &= -g(e_1, e_1) - g(e_2, e_2) - \dots - g(e_m, e_m) \\ &= -m \end{aligned}$$

We get $g(H, \xi) = -1$. So $\ker F_$ has not minimal fibres.*

By virtue of Remark 3, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Let $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ be an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion where $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ is a Kenmotsu manifold and (N, g_N) is a Riemannian manifold. Then F is not harmonic.*

3.2. Anti-invariant Riemannian submersions admitting vertical structure vector field. In this subsection, we will prove that there do not exist (anti-invariant) Riemannian submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds such that characteristic vector field ξ is a vertical vector field. Moreover, we will give a method to get horizontally conformal submersion examples from warped product manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds.

It is easy to see that μ is an invariant distribution of $(\ker F_*)^\perp$, under the endomorphism ϕ . Thus, for $X \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$, we have

$$(3.11) \quad \phi X = BX + CX,$$

where $BX \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$ and $CX \in \Gamma(\mu)$. On the other hand, since $F_*((\ker F_*)^\perp) = TN$ and F is a Riemannian submersion, using (3.11) we derive $g_N(F_*\phi V, F_*CX) = 0$, for every $X \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$ and $V \in \Gamma(\ker F_*)$, which implies that

$$(3.12) \quad TN = F_*(\phi(\ker F_*)) \oplus F_*(\mu).$$

Theorem 7. *Let $(M^{m+1} = I \times_f L^m, g_M = dt^2 + f^2 g_L)$ be a warped product manifold of an interval I and a Riemannian manifold L . If $F : (M^{m+1}, g_M) \rightarrow (N^n, g_N)$ is a Riemannian submersion with vertical vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \partial_t$ then warped product manifold is a Riemannian product manifold.*

Proof. Let $\sigma = (t, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ be a coordinate system for M at $p \in M$ and y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n be a coordinate system for N at $F(p)$. Since ∂_t is a vertical vector field, we have

$$0 = F_*(\partial_t)_p = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial(y_i \circ F)}{\partial t}(p) \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \Big|_{F(p)}.$$

So the component functions $y_i \circ F = f_i$ of F do not contain t parameter. Namely,

$$F : I \times_f L \rightarrow N, (t, x) \rightarrow F(t, x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x)),$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ and also $(\ker F_*)^\perp|_{(t,x)} \subseteq T_{(t,x)}(\{t\} \times L) \cong T_x L$ at point $p = (t, x) \in M$. That is, if $\tilde{X} \in (\ker F_*)^\perp$, there is a vector field $X \in \Gamma(TN)$ such that the lift of X to $I \times L$ is the vector field \tilde{X} , $\pi_{2*}(\tilde{X}_p) = X_{\pi_2(p)}$ for all $p \in M$. For the sake of the simplify we use the same notation for a vector field and for its lift.

Using Proposition 1 (ii), we obtain

$$(3.13) \quad \nabla_X \partial_t = \frac{f'}{f} X$$

for $X \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$. From (2.14) and (3.13) we have

$$(3.14) \quad \mathcal{A}_X \partial_t = \frac{f'}{f} X$$

for $X \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$.

By applying (2.11), (2.18) and (3.14), we find

$$g_M(\mathcal{A}_X Y, \partial_t) = -\frac{f'}{f} g_M(X, Y) = -\frac{f'}{f} g_M(Y, X) = g_M(\mathcal{A}_Y X, \partial_t) = -g_M(\mathcal{A}_X Y, \partial_t)$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker F_*)^\perp)$. Thus, we obtain

$$(3.15) \quad g_M(\mathcal{A}_X Y, \partial_t) = -\frac{f'}{f} g_M(X, Y) = 0.$$

It follows from (3.15) that $f' = 0$. Hence warping function f must be constant. Therefore, up to a change of scale, M is a Riemannian product manifold. \square

Theorem 8. *Let $M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M)$ be a Kenmotsu manifold of dimension $2m + 1$ and (N, g_N) is a Riemannian manifold of dimension n . There does not exist a Riemannian submersion $F : M(\phi, \xi, \eta, g_M) \rightarrow (N, g_N)$ such that characteristic vector field ξ is a vertical vector field.*

Proof. From [14] we know that locally a Kenmotsu manifold is a warped product $I \times_f L$ of an interval I and a Kaehler manifold L with metric $g_M = dt^2 + f^2 g_L$ and warping function $f(t) = se^t$, where s is a positive constant. Let $\xi = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \partial_t$ be a vertical vector field. It follows from Theorem 7, M is a Riemannian product manifold. Since $f(t) = se^t$ is not constant, M can not be a Riemannian product manifold. This is a contradiction which completes the proof of theorem. \square

Theorem 9. *Let $M = M_1 \times_f M_2$ be a warped product manifold with metric $g = g_1 + f^2 g_2$, $\pi_2 : M_1 \times M_2 \rightarrow M_2$ second canonical projection and (M_3, g_3) Riemannian manifold. If f_1 is a Riemannian submersion from M_2 onto M_3 then $f_2 = f_1 \circ \pi_2 : M \rightarrow M_3$ is a horizontally conformal submersion.*

Proof. Since f_1 is a Riemannian submersion, $\text{rank } f_1 = \dim M_3$. Using Proposition 2, we have $\text{rank } f_2|_{(p,q)} = \text{rank } f_1|_{f_1(q)} = \dim M_3$ for any point $(p, q) \in M$. Consequently f_2 is a submersion. Since π_2 is a natural horizontally conformal submersion for a warped product manifold, we get $\ker \pi_{2*}|_{(p,q)} = T_{(p,q)} M_1 \equiv T_{(p,q)}(M_1 \times \{q\}) \cong T_p M_1$. So $\ker f_{2*}|_{(p,q)} \cong T_p M_1 \times \ker f_{1*}|_q$ and $(\ker f_{2*})^\perp|_{(p,q)} = \{p\} \times (\ker f_{1*})^\perp|_q \cong (\ker f_{1*})^\perp|_q$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} g(X, Y) &= f^2(p) g_2(\pi_{2*}(X), \pi_{2*}(Y)) \\ &= f^2(p) g_3(f_{1*}(\pi_{2*}(X)), f_{1*}(\pi_{2*}(Y))) \\ &= f^2(p) g_3(f_{2*}(X), f_{2*}(Y)) \end{aligned}$$

for $X, Y \in \Gamma((\ker f_{2*})^\perp)$. So we get the requested result. \square

Remark 4. *Theorem 9 gives a chance to produce horizontally conformal submersion examples.*

4. EXAMPLES

We now give some examples for anti-invariant submersion and anti-invariant horizontally conformal submersions from Kenmotsu manifolds.

Example 2. *Let M be a Kenmotsu manifold as in Example 1. Let N be $\mathbb{R} \times_{e^z} \mathbb{R}^2$. The Riemannian metric tensor field g_N is defined by $g_N = e^{2z}(du \otimes du + dv \otimes dv) + dz \otimes dz$ on N .*

Let $F : M \rightarrow N$ be a map defined by $F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, t) = (\frac{x_1+y_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_2+y_1}{\sqrt{2}}, z)$. Then, a simple calculation gives

$$\ker F_* = \text{span}\{V_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_2 - E_3), V_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_1 - E_4)\}$$

and

$$(\ker F_*)^\perp = \text{span}\{H_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_1 + E_4), H_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_2 + E_3), H_3 = E_5 = \xi\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that F is a Riemannian submersion. Moreover, $\phi V_1 = -H_1$, $\phi V_2 = -H_2$ imply that $\phi(\ker F_*) \subset (\ker F_*)^\perp = \phi(\ker F_*) \oplus \{\xi\}$. Thus F is an anti-invariant Riemannian submersion such that ξ is a horizontal vector field.

Example 3. Let M be a Kenmotsu manifold as in Example 1 and N be \mathbb{R}^2 . The Riemannian metric tensor field g_N is defined by $g_N = e^{2z}(du \otimes du + dv \otimes dv)$ on N .

Let $F : M \rightarrow N$ be a map defined by $F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z) = (\frac{x_1+y_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{x_2+y_1}{\sqrt{2}})$. Then, by direct calculations we have

$$\ker F_* = \text{span}\{V_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_3 - E_2), V_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_4 - E_1), V_3 = E_5 = \xi = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\}$$

and

$$(\ker F_*)^\perp = \text{span}\{H_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_3 + E_2), H_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_4 + E_1)\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that F is a horizontally conformal submersion. Moreover, $\phi V_1 = H_2$, $\phi V_2 = H_1$, $\phi V_3 = 0$ imply that $\phi(\ker F_*) = (\ker F_*)^\perp$. As a result, F is an anti-invariant horizontally conformal submersion such that ξ is a vertical vector field.

Remark 5. Recently Akyol M.A. and Şahin B. [1] studied conformal anti-invariant submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds. So it will be worth the study area which is anti-invariant (horizontally) conformal submersion from almost contact metric manifolds onto Riemannian manifolds.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to the referee for his/her valuable comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akyol M. A, Şahin B., *Conformal anti-invariant submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds*, Turk J. Math., DOI: 10.3906/mat-1408-20.
- [2] Baird P., Wood J.C., *Harmonic Morphisms Between Riemannian Manifolds*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, 29, Oxford University Press, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2003.
- [3] Blair D. E., *Riemannian geometry of contact and symplectic manifolds*, Progress in Mathematics. 203, Birkhauser Boston, Basel, Berlin, 2002.
- [4] Bourguignon J. P., Lawson H. B., *Stability and isolation phenomena for Yang-mills fields*, Commun. Math. Phys. 79, (1981), 189-230.
- [5] Bourguignon J. P., Lawson H. B., *A Mathematician's visit to Kaluza-Klein theory*, Rend. Semin. Mat. Torino Fasc. Spec. (1989), 143-163.
- [6] Brickell F., Clark R. S., *Differentiable Manifolds*, London ; New York : V. N. Reinhold Co., (1970).
- [7] Chen B. Y., *Geometry of slant submanifolds*, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, 1990.
- [8] Falcitelli M., Ianus S., and Pastore A. M., *Riemannian submersions and related topics*, World Scientific Publishing Co., 2004.
- [9] Gray A., *Pseudo-Riemannian almost product manifolds and submersions*, J. Math. Mech, 16 (1967), 715-737.
- [10] Ianus S., Visinescu M., *Kaluza-Klein theory with scalar fields and generalized Hopf manifolds*, Class. Quantum Gravity 4, (1987), 1317-1325.
- [11] Ianus S., Visinescu M., *Space-time compactification and Riemannian submersions*, In: Rasiias, G.(ed.) The Mathematical Heritage of C. F. Gauss, (1991), 358-371, World Scientific, River Edge.

- [12] Ianus S., Mazzocco R., Vilcu G. E., *Riemannian submersions from quaternionic manifolds*, Acta Appl. Math. 104, (2008) 83-89.
- [13] Ianus S., Ionescu A. M., Mazzocco R., Vilcu G. E., *Riemannian submersions from almost contact metric manifolds*, Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hambg. 81, (2011), 101–114
- [14] Kenmotsu, K., *A class of almost contact Riemannian manifolds*, Tohoku Math. J., 24(2), (1972), 93-103.
- [15] Murathan C., Kupeli Erken I., *Anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from cosymplectic manifolds*, Filomat, 29(7), (2015).
- [16] O'Neill B., *The fundamental equations of submersion*, Michigan Math. J. 13, (1966) 459-469.
- [17] O'Neill B., *Semi-Riemannian geometry with applications to relativity*, Academic Press, New York-London 1983.
- [18] Ornea L., Romani G., *The fundamental equations of conformal submersions*, Beiträge Algebra Geom. 34 no. 2 (1993), 233–243.
- [19] Park K. S., *H-slant submersions*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. 49(2), (2012), 329-338.
- [20] Park K. S., *H-semi-invariant submersions*, Taiwanese J. Math., 16(5), (2012), 1865-1878.
- [21] Ponge R., Reckziegel H., *Twisted products in pseudo-Riemannian geometry*, Geom. Dedicata, 48(1), (1993), 15-25.
- [22] Şahin B., *Anti-invariant Riemannian submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. 8(3), (2010) 437-447.
- [23] Şahin B., *Slant submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie Tome 54(102) No. 1, (2011), 93 - 105.
- [24] Şahin B., *Riemannian submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds*, Taiwanese J. Math., 17, No. 2, (2012), 629-659.
- [25] Şahin B., *Semi-invariant submersions from almost Hermitian manifolds*, Canad. Math. Bull., 56(1), (2013), 173-183.
- [26] Watson B., *Almost Hermitian submersions*, J. Differential Geom., 11(1), (1976), 147-165.
- [27] Watson B., *G, G'-Riemannian submersions and nonlinear gauge field equations of general relativity*, In: Rassias, T. (ed.) Global Analysis - Analysis on manifolds, dedicated M. Morse. Teubner-Texte Math., 57 (1983), 324-349, Teubner, Leipzig.
- [28] M. T. Mustafa, *Applications of harmonic morphisms to gravity*, J. Math. Phys., 41(10), (2000), 6918-6929.

E-mail address: ayseyilmazsoyberi@gmail.com

ART AND SCIENCE FACULTY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ULUDAG UNIVERSITY, 16059 BURSA, TURKEY

E-mail address: iremkupeli@uludag.edu.tr

ULUDAG UNIVERSITY, FACULTY OF ART AND SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GORUKLE 16059 BURSA, TURKEY

E-mail address: cengiz@uludag.edu.tr